Citizen Advisory Committee Wildlife Management Unit 2C Final Report

March 19, 2007



Pennsylvania Game Commission

Governor's Office of Administration



	PAGE INTENTIALLY BLANK
	I AGE INTENTIALET BLANK
Ī	

Introduction and Overview

An objective in the Pennsylvania Game Commission's (PGC) deer management plan was the use of local stakeholder groups to recommend a Wildlife Management Unit (WMU) specific deer population goal. Through a local Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), comprised of representatives of stakeholder groups within WMU 2C, participants communicated population goal recommendations based on input actively solicited and obtained from individuals within each representative's stakeholder group.

After recruiting stakeholder representatives from individuals recommended by PGC field staff and other outside organizations, the Bureau of Management Consulting (BMC) staff convened and facilitated an introductory and educational meeting on February 6, 2007. BMC staff asked CAC members to attempt to communicate with 10 representatives from each of their respective stakeholder groups. BMC facilitated a subsequent meeting on March 6, 2007 for the purpose of representatives providing stakeholder feedback, collectively discussing summaries of stakeholder perspectives, and reaching consensus, if possible, regarding a deer population goal recommendation for WMU 2C. CAC membership and attendance at both meetings is shown in Exhibit 1.

The following is documentation relative to this process. It includes meeting agendas, information requested of and provided by PGC staff, stakeholder representative findings, the context of various perspectives, and the resulting consensus that led to the <u>CAC recommendation</u> of a deer population goal for WMU 2C over the next five years:

Seven attending CAC members agreed with an increase of 25% to 50% in the WMU 2C deer herd. An additional member, who did not attend the second meeting, was in favor of an increase.

Exhibit 1					
List of CAC Stakeholder Groups/Representatives and Attendance at Meetings					
Stakeholder Group	Representative (*Primary Member)	February 6	March 6		
Ag-Commercial nurseries/orchards	John Wilkenson*	✓			
Ag-Livestock/cash crops	Ted Kuckuck	✓			
Business (direct impact)	Mark Zimmerman*	✓	✓		
Business (direct impact)	Mike Wisseman	✓			
Conservationist/Wildlife Recreation	Theresa Rohall*	✓	✓		
Conservationist/Wildlife Recreation	Tom Karkabar	✓			
Forest industry	David Beckner	✓			
Forest industry	Scott Smith*	✓	✓		
Highway safety	James Fulmer*	✓	✓		
Public landowners	Mike Schaffer*	✓	✓		
Rural non-farm landowner	Lowell King*	✓	✓		
Rural non-farm landowner	Walt Hensel	√			
Sportsmen (resident)	Jim Davis*	√	✓		
Sportsmen (resident)	Joe Miller	√			

First Meeting Summary

The purpose of the first meeting was to provide information to the members about the CAC process as well as background on deer management, both statewide, and within WMU 2C. BMC staff also polled members on their initial thoughts on the deer population in WMU 2C. This is presented as part of Table 1 on page 8, which includes the complete voting history. The first meetings agenda is shown in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2 Citizen Advisory Committee Public Input for Deer Management Goals in Pennsylvania Meeting Agenda, February 6, 2007

Meeting Agenda, February 6, 2007			
I. Introduction	IV. PGC Presentations		
A. Stakeholder introductions	A. PGC responsibilities and mission		
II. Overview of the process	B. History of deer management in Pennsylvania		
A. Purpose	C. Deer resource information and management system		
B. Objectives	D. Consequences of biological and social management		
C. Process/Consensus	at different deer population levels		
D. Role of participants	E. Question		
1. Primary versus secondary	V. Preparation Work for Second Meeting		
E. Meeting ground rules	A. Consensus		
F. Questions	B. Stakeholder Opinion Worksheet		
III. Present Tabulation of Initial Thoughts	C. Presentation Template for Stakeholder Summaries		
	D. Agenda for second meeting		
	E. Primary and secondary designation		
	VI. Questions and Comments		

Prior to the first meeting, members received a document entitled "Pennsylvania Game Commission Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Pilot Study, Objectives and Process Overview," which explained each of the items under the second area covered in the agenda and the worksheet and template listed in the fifth area of the agenda. Highlights from the first meeting included reviewing the following information.

PGC Deer Management Program Goals:

- 1. Maintain a healthy deer herd.
- 2. Maintain healthy forest habitat for the deer herd.
- 3. Reduce deer and human conflict.

Objectives of CACs:

- A. They provide an opportunity for the Game Commission to *understand stakeholder values* regarding deer management.
- B. They provide an opportunity for stakeholders to *interact* with one another, facilitate communication among, and increase understanding of different stakeholder values and concerns.
- C. They provide an opportunity for stakeholders to have <u>direct input</u> concerning deer population goals that ultimately affect all Pennsylvanians.
- D. They provide an opportunity to <u>inform stakeholders</u> on the mission of the Game Commission, complexities of deer management, and

the importance of proper management.

Outcome of CAC proceedings:

- 1. The goal is to build consensus among the committee and agree on a recommendation to increase, decrease, or stabilize the deer population in their WMU.
- 2. Definition of consensus: Consensus is reached if all but one member agrees with the other members.
- 3. If a consensus has been reached, the committee will present the recommendation to the Game Commission in a written format that explains how each stakeholder group's concerns were considered in the decision.
- 4. If a consensus cannot be reached among committee members, a recommendation will be made following the guidelines given in the first meeting.

PGC staff grounded the process in an overview of the mission and history of the Commission, as well as details about the deer management program in conjunction with the goals of maintaining a healthy deer herd and a healthy forest habitat. Especially effective was the historical perspective on how deer management has been an emotional and controversial issue going back to the origins of the Commission. Specific deer and habitat data for WMU 2C were presented.

Members were provided with forms to collect opinions from other people within their stakeholder area as well as summarize the results into an overall report. For each stakeholder group, the goal was to speak with at least 10 other people. The meeting ended with questions and comments as shown in Exhibit 3.

Exhibit 3 Questions, Answers, and Comments Following PGC Presentation on February 6, 2007

- 1. Q. Why are six-month old deer not used to determine overall health?
 - A. This is a factor that is considered. Adult does contribute the most to the population. Fawns at 70 pounds will breed. When poor habitat is existent, the fawns drop out of breeding.
- 2. CAC Member Comment: Fawns are the canary in the coal mine. Why not heavier consideration placed on fawns in determining overall health?
- 3. Q. Is there better reproduction in agricultural areas?
 - A. What may be happening is that the WMUs are set up to track forest and agricultural land. They can't draw conclusions at that level.
- 4. Q. Are there any other studies that don't blame deer for poor regeneration of habitat?
 - A. Yes, there are many factors that influence forest regeneration. This is why the PGC uses a simple habitat measure (i.e., can forests regenerate?) that takes into account a group of tree species and not a single tree species.
- 5. Q. Is the PGC creating any habitat, particularly on game lands?
 - A. PGC timber harvests are based on wildlife considerations, not just deer, and they occur on a small percentage of SGLs each year.

Exhibit 3

Questions, Answers, and Comments Following PGC Presentation on February 6, 2007

- 6. Q. On big timberlands, is PGC managing the game lands for deer?
 - A. Again, SGLs are managed for wildlife, including but not specific to deer.
- 7. Q. A doe fawn at 70 pounds at 6 months old will be bred in December?
 - A. Yes
- 8. Q. Are pre-/post-infrared surveys still done?
 - A. That data is not used for PGC purposes. To do it at the unit level would be tough.
- 9. Q. Why are youth hunting programs being cut?
 - A. The whole pheasant program has been cut.
- 10. Q. How does PGC derive the measure for a "poor" habitat?
 - A. This is derived from part of the U.S. Forest Service analysis, which analyzes 1/5 of study plots each year and is specifically focused on forest regeneration (check seedlings, saplings, etc.). The analysis focuses on whether or not a forest is adequately stocked. The PGC has seen U.S. Forest Service data from 1500-1600 plots. If less than half of the plots don't have adequate regeneration, they are considered poor.
- 11. Q. Twenty two percent of land is farmed in WMU 2C. What part does this play in deer habitat quality? A. PGC is looking specifically at forested habitat. CAC will help to capture information about agricultural lands, landscaping, etc., since data is not collected about these types of lands. PGC prefers to keep the data as simple as possible.
- 12. Q. Can the PGC provide a simple course on forest succession?
 - A. From the period of 20 years to the point when timber trees are ready for sawing, regeneration and habitat quality is poor. Regeneration starts establishing again after a period of 80 years. The measure is only an 80-year measure or in early timeframe when the sun is still hitting the ground. [Most of the preceding comments were made by the CAC member making the question. The following sentences capture the PGC response.] The middle years are not included in habitat/regeneration data. The ability of a forest to support deer changes through time. When in the seedling/sapling stage a forest area can support many deer. As the forest matures, it supports fewer deer until it reaches saw timber stage when more deer can be supported. Cutting forests to get more seedling/sapling areas can work for a time period, but it will eventually reach pole timber stage when fewer deer can be supported. The PGC's forest habitat measure only includes areas that receive enough light for regeneration to occur.
- 13. CAC Member Comment: Member's sportsmen club has been working with DCNR, who recently conducted a forest inventory that found there are only two deer per square mile in their area. The local PGC land manager assisted in developing food plots for the sportsmen club. Pleased to see local PGC helping in this way, which has been a positive experience.
- 14. Q. Does PGC have deer population statistics for WMU 2C?
 - A. The population varies within local areas. WMUs are based on what kind of and how much information can be collected. WMUs will never be managed at the micro level.
- 15. CAC Member Comment: The PGC isn't really managing deer on the state game lands.
 - A. Pennsylvania is unique in that there is a lot of public land and private land open to hunting.
- 16. CAC Member Comment: The state game lands should be managed for deer.
- 17. CAC Member Comment: CAC member hasn't bought into the process for calculating deer harvest estimates. The public needs confidence in these numbers.
 - A. Without 100 percent reporting, the PGC must rely on estimates. Currently, the PGC uses a reporting rate to determine estimates. They know that the reporting count is not accurate, so the PGC has to estimate, and

Exhibit 3

Questions, Answers, and Comments Following PGC Presentation on February 6, 2007

they use standard estimating practices.

- 18. Q. With the number of hunters declining, has PGC thought about the impact of this on the deer population?
 - A. Hunter numbers peaked in 1983 and have decreased since then, and the PGC hunter education program has been trying to address this problem. This decline is a national trend, and every state will be dealing with this decline. The average age of a hunter is 50 years old.
- 19. What is the difference between the PGC commissioners and the CACs?
 - A. The commissioners make the decisions. The CAC recommendations will go to the PGC deer section, who presents the recommendations to the commissioners. The CAC is a way to gather structured input.
- 20. Q. Are the CAC members looking at the entire WMU?
 - A. The members should gather feedback from anyone within the WMU that fits into that member's constituency group.
- 21. Q. How can feedback forms be distributed?
 - A. Feedback can be collected over the phone, in person, by mail or by e-mail. The constituent doesn't need to personally complete the form to provide feedback.
- 22. Q. Can the process be publicized with groups (for example, sportsmen groups)?
 - A. Yes.
- 23. Q. Is there any room to provide input beyond the scope of the feedback questionnaire?
 - A. The PGC will focus on the information contained on the form, but they will listen to ideas/suggestions if they come up.

Exhibit 4 Information Regarding the Second CAC Meeting, February 6, 2007

The second CAC meeting will be held on March 6, 2007. It will take place at the Somerset County Conservation District (same location) at 7:00 P.M.

The following stakeholder groups decided primary/secondary membership on the CAC as follows:

Stakeholder Group	Primary member	Secondary member
Agriculture	John Wilkenson	Ted Kuckuck
Business (direct impact)	Mark Zimmerman*	Mike Wisseman
Conservation/Wildlife Recreation	Theresa Rohall	Tom Karkabar
Forest Industry	Scott Smith	David Beckner
Rural Non-Farm Landowner	Lowell King	Walt Hensel
Sportsman-resident	Jim Davis	Joe Miller

^{*}Mark Zimmerman was unable to attend the second meeting, so Mike Wisseman attended in his place.

Second Meeting Summary

The purpose of the second meeting was for the members to present their findings, ask questions of one another, and attempt to move towards consensus. The meeting's agenda is shown in Exhibit 5.

Exhibit 5 Citizen Advisory Committee Public Input for Deer Management Goals in Pennsylvania Meeting Agenda, March 6, 2007

I. Quick Review

- A. Review of CAC handout document
- B. Process for this meeting

II. Interest Group Presentations

- A. Presentations
- B. Clarification
- C. Initial tally of interest group positions

Break

III. Discussion/Consensus

IV. Next Steps

- A. BMC completes summary of proceedings
- B. Summary is sent to CAC members and Game Commission staff
- C. PGC staff incorporates the recommendation into the deer management plan presented to the Commissioners
- V. Ouestions and Comments
- VI. Evaluation of the Process

For each stakeholder group, four questions were posed for the members to answer. In addition, members were asked to collect comments to answer why those among their stakeholder group feels the way they do. The individual stakeholder reports are included as Appendix A.

The questions are as follows:

- A. In your opinion, is the deer herd in your area (WMU 2C) increasing, decreasing, or stable?
- B. In your opinion, is the deer herd in your area (WMU 2C) too high, too low, or About right?
- C. In your opinion, do you think the deer herd should increase, decrease, or remain the same?
- D. In your opinion, by what percentage should the deer herd in your area (WMU 2C) increase or decrease?

At the beginning of this discussion, BMC tabulated the results of stakeholder sentiment reported at the March 6th meeting (based on responses from 300 individuals) and displayed it on a table that was subsequently compared to the results of CAC member sentiment (based on responses from 14 individuals) that they provided at the beginning of the February 6th meeting. As indicated in Table 1, some results were unchanged and some demonstrated variance.

The individual reports resulted in a more pronounced view that the WMU 2C deer herd was currently decreasing. Only the conservationist/wildlife recreationist stakeholder representative reported a differing opinion. Half of the conservationist/wildlife recreationist respondents felt the herd was increasing, and half felt the herd was decreasing. The majority of individual reports

resulted in a shift toward recommending that the deer herd should increase over the next five years.

Following the individual reports, the facilitators visually displayed each stakeholder group's recommendation (increase, decrease or stable) and recommended percentage increase or decrease. The group reached agreement fairly quickly that there should be an increase in the deer herd. Because agreement could not be reached as easily on a specific percentage increase, the group decided to recommend a percentage range (25% to 50%) that more effectively incorporated the stakeholder feedback. The conservationist/wildlife recreationist expressed concern about the high percentage range; however, she stated she would give her support if the group stated in the recommendation that there is a need to manage WMU areas differently (i.e. WMU 2C is too big an area to provide a generalized recommendation).

The discussion was extensive, and details are included in Appendix B. There was agreement among the group that the geographic area under consideration is too large, and that different management methods should be applied to different areas to control high and low herd population areas. The agriculture representative was not present at the second meeting; however, he provided his constituent feedback to the Bureau of Management Consulting following the meeting and was in agreement that there should be an increase in the deer herd.

After much thought and consideration, the following consensus was reached:

Increase Decrease

Seven attending CAC members agreed with an increase of 25% to 50% in the WMU 2C deer herd. An additional member, who did not attend the second meeting, was in favor of an increase

Table 1

CAC Voting Summary for WMU 2C Deer Herd Questions and Consensus Decision February 6, 2007 March 6, 2007			
Question	Initial Vote	Presentation Results	Consensus Decision
In your opinion, is the deer heard in WMU2C increasing, decreasing, or stable?			
o Increasing	1	.5	
o Decreasing	10	6.5	
o Stable	1	0	
o Do Not Know	2	0	
In your opinion, is the deer heard in WMU2C too high, too low, or About right?			
o Too High	2	1.5	
o Too Low	5	3.5	
o About right	5	2	
o Do Not Know	1	0	
Over the next five years, do you think the deer herd in WMU2C should increase, decrease, or remain the same?			

X

Table 1 CAC Voting Summary for WMU 2C Deer Herd Questions and Consensus Decision

	February 6, 2007	March 6, 2007	March 6, 2007
Question	Initial Vote	Presentation	Consensus
		Results	Decision
o Remain The Same	1	2	
o Do Not Know	1	0	
Increase by approximately how much (percent)?	10, 20, 30, 35,	40, 44, 50, 90	25-50
	50, 100		
Decrease by approximately how much (percent)?	10, 20, 50	25	
Number of present CAC members	14	7	
Number of stakeholder feedback collected by CAC	Not Applicable	300	
members			

APPENDIX A: Individual Stakeholder Reports

- A. In your opinion, is the deer herd in your area (WMU 2C) increasing, decreasing, or stable?
- B. In your opinion, is the deer herd in your area (WMU 2C) too high, too low, or About right?
- C. In your opinion, do you think the deer herd should increase, decrease, or remain the same?
- D. In your opinion, by what percentage should the deer herd in your area (WMU 2C) increase or decrease?

1. Business (direct impact) – Mike Wisseman

(18 responses)

Answers to Questions

- A. Decreasing-16, Stable-2
- B. Too low-16, About right-2
- C. Increase-17, Same-1
- D. Average increase of 50%.

Whys – Keep more hunters and much concern over youth hunters.

Benefits – Keep hunters in the sport and bring more youth into the sport.

Consequences – The forest would suffer.

<u>2. Conservationist/Wildlife Recreationist – Theresa Rohall</u>

(32 responses)

Answers to Questions

- A. Decreasing-18, Increasing-8, Stable-5, Don't know-1
- B. Too High-14, Too Low-13, About right-4, Don't know-1
- C. Increase-14, Decrease-14, Same-3, Don't know-1
- D. For those indicating increase, average of 90.35%. This average includes a respondent that suggested a 500% increase, which shifts the average higher. For those indicating decrease, average of 25.44% decrease.

Whys – Those suggesting a decrease indicated the following "whys": The deer herd is managed to take into account all species; more quantitative measurements and smaller plots and ranges are necessary. Those suggesting an increase suggested that with a larger deer population, it is easier to see and hunt deer.

Benefits – Benefits to decreasing include a healthy, diverse and sustainable ecosystem. Benefits to increasing include ease of harvesting deer and increased license sales.

Consequences – A consequence to increasing the herd is further degradation of habitat. A consequence of decreasing the herd is unhappy deer hunters.

3. Forest Industry – Scott Smith

(19 responses)

Answers to Questions

- A. Decreasing-19
- B. Too Low-18, About right-1
- C. Increase-18, Don't know-1
- D. Average of responses was a 40.25% increase (average is 25% increase without the outliers, i.e. those at 100% and higher).

Whys – Youth are losing interest (Bill Jordan syndrome), and loss of revenue due to license sales decreasing.

Benefits – Continue hunting heritage, help get kids involved in the outdoors and the camaraderie of hunting.

Consequences – More vehicle/deer collisions.

4. Highway Safety – James Fulmer

(10 responses)

Answers to Questions

- A. Increasing-5, Decreasing-5
- B. Too High-5, Too Low-5
- C. Increase-5, Decrease-5
- D. Slight increase.

Whys – The older troopers have more time to hunt, so they were interested in having a higher deer population. The younger troops have more of a need to see less deer, or keep the population stable.

5. Public Landowners – Mike Schaffer

(14 responses)

Answers to Questions

- A. Decreasing-11, Stable-3
- B. About right-7, Too Low-5, Too High-1, Don't know-1
- C. Same-6, Increase-5, Decrease-2, Don't know-1
- D. Remain the same.

Whys – Maintain a healthy deer herd and healthy ecosystem.

Benefits – Health deer herd, healthy ecosystem, better forest regeneration, less crop damage and a better buck to doe ratio.

Consequences – Loss of hunter numbers, loss of hunting interest (especially kids), and less visual sightings/less hunting experience.

6. Rural non-farm Landowner - Lowell King

(16 responses)

Answers to Questions

- A. Decreasing-8, Increasing-3, Stable-4
- B. About right-7, Too Low-6, Too High-2
- C. Same-9, Increase-7
- D. Average increase of 44%.

Whys – The reasons why depend on why the respondents own land. For those who said decrease, the reason is improved forests. For those who said increase, the reason is increased hunting. Non-residents did not seem to care.

Benefits – For those who suggested increasing the deer herd, benefits would include keeping youth interested in hunting and keeping PA license fees reasonable.

Consequences – For those who suggested increasing the deer herd, consequences include an adverse impact on the forest and increased vehicle-deer accidents.

7. Resident Sportsmen – Jim Davis

(191 responses)

Answers to Questions

- A. Decreasing-175, Stable-8, Don't know-5, Increasing-3
- B. Too Low-174, About right-13, Don't know-4
- C. Increase-173, Decrease-13, Don't know-5
- D. No less than a 50% increase. Most respondents stated a percentage increase within the range of 50-100%.

Whys – The herd can increase and not impact on regeneration. Tools are available to meet the needs of private landowners that need to have deer harvested.

Benefits – Returning some fun to hunting, protecting regeneration, encouraging youth participation, and the PGC being viewed as taking positive action with their deer management goals

Consequences – All stakeholders win along with improved habitat and deer herd.

8. Agriculture – John Wilkenson

Answers to Questions

(19 responses)

- A. Decreasing-7, Stable-7, Increasing-5
- B. Too high-9, About right-9, Too low-1
- C. Decrease-9, Remain the same-7, Increase-2, Unknown-1
- D. Average decrease of 25%.

Whys – These people (agriculture stakeholders) are making a living on the same property where the deer are.

Benefits – More profit; less hassle.

Consequences – It's going to be difficult to please all.

Note: The agriculture representative did not attend the second CAC meeting, but submitted his summary worksheet and survey results to the Bureau of Management Consulting afterwards. Although the results above suggest an agriculture stakeholder group recommendation to decrease or stabilize the deer herd in WMU 2C, John Wilkenson told BMC staff verbally that he would support a deer herd increase.

APPENDIX B: CAC Member Points During Consensus Discussion and Decision

- The public safety representative commented that there is a simple equation between the number of deer, vehicle speed and number of vehicles in highly populated area. Increases in these variables result in more deer-car accidents. Accidents are more common on higher speed roads. Another respondent added that people are driving faster on country roads, too.
- WMU 2C is too big geographically, and that it would be easier to arrive at a consensus if the area were smaller. Different areas within the WMU 2C make it difficult to make comparisons. This is not a comparison of "apples to apples." PGC commented that PGC would have to double their workforce in order to manage by smaller WMUs.
- WMU 2C is very diverse. WMU has the highest and lowest elevation points in PA.
- The deer hunter is unwilling to change where they hunt. This may be an area where education is needed. There could be an opportunity for the PGC to offer a different license/permit for people who don't necessarily want to hunt. One respondent proposed a conservation license to support PGC and give non-hunters a voice in the management of WMU wildlife.
- It is hard for bucks to get to the point where they are sized appropriately for taxidermy.
- The PGC should have started antler restrictions first, and then reduced the herd numbers. This would have been better received by the hunting community.
- A two week doe season is way too much The herd is too low. PGC commented that the number of antlerless tags is reason for the reduction, not the season length. It generally takes three tags or more tags to harvest one deer.
- PGC asked the committee members: Can your group tolerate more deer? The PGC needs to be responsible managers.
- The conservationist/wildlife recreationist representative questioned whether or not the conservationists and wildlife recreationists should actually be divided into two separate groups. The opinions she received from these two groups were split down the middle.
- One representative suggested that the WMU map be included with the survey forms.
- The foresters surveyed were almost all hunters. Their responses were not necessarily focused on regeneration. The conservationist/wildlife recreationist representative stated that the foresters she knows would have stated the opposite view as was presented by the forestry stakeholder.
- There is a problem with getting hunters to report harvest numbers. PGC commented that the reporting rate dropped again this year. The PGC can only produce what they are given.
- One member suggested including a checkbox when hunters buy their hunting license where they can check whether or not they harvested any deer the prior year, and how many. Another member stated that some hunters still would not check that box and provide the information.
- The public safety member suggested that infrared technology can provide a hard population number that cannot be argued with. PGC responded that infrared technology only provides a snapshot in time.

- One member asked how the PGC can manage "hot" (highly populated) and "cold" (lower populated) deer population areas?
- Private land is fast closing down to hunting. This forces more hunters on public land, which causes over-hunting in these areas. Some tools (DMAP, agriculture permits) are available for private land, but not public land (only doe license changes). Why not issue DMAPs for public land? DMAP is no different than doe licenses. Hunter stakeholders want to see management of hot and cold lands. [PGC response: Issuing DMAPs for public land would restrict public land use. Only 9 percent of WMU 2C is public land.]
- It is hard to move a hunter from their normal hunting location to another area (it is hard to move them "from their rock."). PGC needs to look at the areas within WMU 2C differently.
- Regeneration is coming and becoming sustainable. The forestry member said that a 10 percent deer population increase over the next five years seems reasonable.
- The deer population increase should be enough so that hunting is fun, but isn't detrimental to the habitat.
- There is concern with regeneration data and the poor rating assigned to WMU 2C.
- Sportsmen in WMU 2C are waiting for the PGC to fulfill the promise of increasing the deer herd within two years if the population is too low.
- Hunting is a huge business/industry in PA. But there is also an economic basis for people that want to see the outdoors, nature and forestry. There is an interest in restoring a healthy, vibrant forest that can't be seen in this state anymore. PA is losing other diversity, such as honey bees and ants.
- There is consensus on the issue that the WMU is too big (geographic area is too broad); and the need to look at hot and cold spots (areas with different populations). The "brush is too broad" for WMU 2C. Committee members felt they cannot make one broad statement for the entire WMU.
- Some of the closure on private land is a result of hunters themselves. There is a need to educate sportsmen on how to respect these lands. There is also a need for tools to manage different types of land (public and private).
- Some members are not willing to say increase or decrease (broadly) for the deer population.
- One member stated that he would not like to see a one-third increase in his area, as this would impact farmers (increase in farmer complaints related to crop damage). There are some places in WMU 2C that wouldn't tolerate a 30 percent increase.
- The group also reached consensus on appending the following statement to this recommendation: There is no such thing as can't; the group would like to look at more specific management methods (public vs. private land) and "hot spots" versus "cold spots."

Conclusion: Seven attending CAC members agreed with an increase of 25% to 50% in the WMU 2C deer herd. An additional member, who did not attend the second meeting, was in favor of an increase.